that there is no necessary connexion between the power of producing excellent works, and the idem and knowledge of their essence, and of the 'manner of producing them: consequently, you ought not to assert, that these things cannot subsist separately in nature, and that nature cannot have of itself what, according to you, the plastic beings received from God. In short, Monsieur Bayle asked, whether these writers maintained, that the plastic and vital natures are only passive instruments in the hand of God, as Monsieur la Clerc seemed to suppose by his comparison of an architect. Monsieur le Cler£ answered,* 'that, according to Dr. Cud worth, the plastic natures were not passive instruments ; but that they are under God's direction, who conducts them, though "we cannot explain after what manner. Nor can the Atheists, added he, retort the argument, because God is the author of the regularity order with which the plastic natures act; whereas, according to the Atheists, matter moves of itself, without any cause to direct it, and to *it* a power of moving regularly. This dispute carried on still further, with some warmth, and a great many repetitions on both sides. But what has been said is sufficient to give the reader a notion of this controversy, for the progress of which he may consult the following books:— Histoire des Ouvrages des Scavans, Decemb. 1704, mrt* 12. Bibliotheque Choisie, torn. viL art. *7.* R6pOBS a*x Questions d'un Provincial, tom. iii. chap* 179. Bibliotheque Choisie, tom. ix. art. 10. pour Mr, Bayle *& MY.* Le Clerc, p. 31, annexed to the fourth volume of the R6pons. aux Quest,

'. Choisie, tom. vi art.7$_r$ p. 422.